

Constantius ὁ Φιλοκτίστης?

NICK HENCK

Vitruvius, in the preface to his work *On Architecture* which he dedicated to Augustus, wrote: “I observed that you cared not only about the common life of all men, and the constitution of the state, but also about the provision of suitable public buildings; so that the state was not only made greater through you by its new provinces, but the majesty of the empire also was expressed through the eminent dignity of its public buildings. . . . Furthermore, with respect to the future, you have such regard to public and private buildings, that they will correspond to the grandeur of our history, and will be a memorial to future ages.”¹ From this it is clear that some at least both viewed the emperor’s providing of public buildings to be every bit as virtuous as his care for his subjects and the constitution, and held that such works redounded to the majesty of the *res publica*. Moreover, no one who is acquainted with Paul Zanker’s work can be left in any doubt as to the numerous functions that Augustus’ immense building program fulfilled, both at Rome and in the provinces. Through these projects he displayed the traditional Roman virtues of *pietas* and *benevolentia*. This highly effective means of propaganda was not surprisingly adopted by the remainder of Julio-Claudian emperors, continued by the Flavian dynasty, and perpetuated by subsequent emperors.

In a like manner, the fourth century witnessed a succession of “builder emperors”; Milan was embellished by Maximian, Thessalonike by Galerius, Nikomedeia by Diocletian, Trier and later Byzantium by Constantine, and Antioch by Valens. Indeed, John Malalas applies the adjective φιλοκτίστης to both Diocletian and Valens, thus demonstrating that at least by his day—he was writing in the last quarter of the sixth century—these emperors had earned a reputation as “lovers of building.” However, another emperor’s name deserves to be added to this list, that of Constantius II (337–361). The extent to which Constantius has been deprived of the treatment and credit due to him is nowhere more apparent than in this context.² His passion for building, and his conse-

This paper originally took the form of a chapter in my D.Phil. thesis, “Images of Constantius II: Ὁ φιλοκτίστης βασιλεὺς and Imperial Propaganda in the Mid-Fourth Century A.D.” (Oxford, 1998); I am therefore indebted to my supervisors, Barbara Levick and Roger Tomlin, my external examiners, E. D. Hunt and E. M. Jeffreys, and also Terry Brown, J. F. Drinkwater, Wolf Liebeschuetz, Neil McLynn, and Cyril Mango, all of whom read and commented on the original. I am also grateful to my two anonymous referees at *DOP* for their suggestions.

¹The translation is that of F. Granger, *Vitruvius: On Building*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1931).

²All too often the 4th century has been portrayed as a period largely devoid of imperial building. See, e.g., R. MacMullen, “Roman Imperial Building in the Provinces,” *HSCPh* 64 (1959): 207–35, esp. 232 n. 85:

quent extensive building activities, have received no treatment in major modern works, though there is extensive evidence for it: Constantius II, it will be shown, is every bit as deserving of the epithet φιλοκτίστης as Diocletian and Valens.

Testimony to Constantius' interest in monumental architecture can be found in Ammianus' description of the emperor's visit to Rome in 357: "But when he [Constantius] came to the Forum of Trajan, a construction unique under the heavens, as we believe, and admirable even in the unanimous opinion of the gods, he stood fast in amazement, turning his attention to the gigantic complex about him, begging description and never again to be imitated by mortal men. Therefore abandoning all hope of attempting anything like it, he said he would and could copy Trajan's steed alone, which stands in the centre of the vestibule, carrying the emperor himself."³ Clearly, Constantius both appreciated and was inclined to emulate the building feats of his predecessors in imperial office. In this instance, however, Prince Ormisda dissuaded Constantius even from undertaking the copying of Trajan's mount.

There are, it is true, great numbers of inscriptions from Rome ostensibly attesting to considerable building activity undertaken by Constantius in the capital.⁴ However, these are misleading since it is evident from the Theodosian Code that the emperor's name was associated with all building work carried out during his reign regardless of whether or not he was in any way connected with it.⁵ (Moreover, Roman emperors, and particularly those of late antiquity, typically claimed by means of inscriptions the credit for constructing buildings that they had in fact merely renovated.) What is interesting about Constantius, as we shall witness below, is that the vast majority of the major works undertaken during his reign were built while the emperor was present at the location, or were at the very least dedicated/consecrated in his presence. Thus the distinction between buildings/monuments that were erected by an emperor and those that were merely erected under an emperor (i.e., during his rule) proves rather unimportant to Constantius' reign. One does not need to credit Constantius with the building of a monument simply on the grounds that he remitted a city's taxes to enable the town's *curia* to afford such an enterprise, or because he channeled revenue from taxation that was originally earmarked for the imperial treasury back into local building projects; his was a far more direct patronage.

"But Diocletian, Constantine and Valentinian are the only major exceptions to a general stagnation stretching on from the Severi." For an even bleaker perspective, see S. Mitchell, "Imperial Building in the Eastern Roman Provinces," *HSCP* 91 (1987): 234–365, esp. 365: "The decline of imperial building in the provinces, noticeable with the death of Hadrian, and leading to an almost total cessation after Marcus Aurelius, may in fact be one of the clearest indications of the transformation of the empire, which was in progress even before the beginning of the third century." Of course, the apparent concentration of imperial building almost solely in the major metropoleis may be held responsible for giving an impression of overall decline in building in the provinces. However, this apparent concentration may well be a distortion arising from the geographical bias of our literary evidence: most of our authors were writing in major metropoleis, e.g., Ammianus in Rome, Libanios and Malalas in Antioch, and the *Chronicon Paschale* in Constantinople.

³Ammianus, 10.16. All 16 translations of Ammianus are those of J. C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1935).

⁴See CIL, vol. 6, for examples too numerous to list here.

⁵*CTh* 15.1.31: "If any judges should inscribe their own names, rather than the name of Our Eternity, on any completed public work, they shall be held guilty of high treason." See also Y. Janvier, *La législation du Bas-Empire romain sur les édifices publics* (Aix-en-Provence, 1969).

Constantius' sojourn at Rome was limited to just thirty days,⁶ giving him little opportunity to contribute personally to the embellishment of the Eternal City. We know, however, that Constantius was responsible for the erection of an Egyptian obelisk "on the barrier of the Circus Maximus."⁷ This obelisk, from the Temple of Ammon in Thebes,⁸ was one of a pair taken by Constantine and shipped downriver to Alexandria.⁹ There the obelisk halted, its journey curtailed by the death of the emperor in 337.¹⁰ The monument remained in Alexandria for twenty years,¹¹ until Constantius decided to ship it to Rome to adorn the Circus Maximus.

Ammianus attributes Constantius' erection of this obelisk at Rome to *vanitas*: an attempt, encouraged by his sycophants, to outdo Augustus, who, while bringing two Helio-politan obelisks to Rome,¹² left this one alone, being "overawed by the difficulties caused by its size."¹³ Ammianus is perhaps correct here, although his sneering at what was in fact a traditional and often lauded trait of Roman emperors—their striving to exceed the accomplishments of their imperial predecessors—reveals his prejudice. On the other hand, it is not impossible that Constantius' main motive for the setting up of this obelisk derived not from *vanitas* but from *pietas*.¹⁴ We know that Constantine had intended to consecrate this monument either at Rome (according to Ammianus)¹⁵ or at Constantinople (according to the inscription Constantius had inscribed on the monolith's base),¹⁶ and it is far from implausible that Constantius, in this instance also, was as determined as ever to ensure the completion of his father's plans.¹⁷ Nor ought we to dismiss political

⁶Ammianus, 16.10.20.

⁷S. Guberti Bassett, "The Antiquities in the Hippodrome of Constantinople," *DOP* 45 (1991): 87–96, esp. 93. Constantius was at Rome from 28 April to 29 May. This would just about have been enough time to erect such a monolith, given that an inscription on the obelisk erected by Theodosios in 390 informs us that it had taken just thirty days ("ter denis . . . diebus") to set up.

⁸This was the seventh (and final) of Tuthmosis III's Karnak obelisks. It was raised in the first half of the 15th century B.C. by Tuthmosis IV, the grandson of Tuthmosis III, the latter having died before he could have it erected.

⁹Ammianus, 17.4.13. See also Guberti Bassett, "Antiquities," 94.

¹⁰Ammianus, 16.4.14: "After these provisions, the aforesaid emperor departed this life and the urgency of the enterprise waned, but at last the obelisk was loaded on the ship, after long delay, and brought over the sea and up the channel of the Tiber."

¹¹Interestingly enough, the obelisk had originally had to lie on the ground for thirty-five years before being erected by Tuthmosis IV.

¹²He erected one in the Circus Maximus, the other in the Campus Martius.

¹³Ammianus, 17.4.13.

¹⁴This represents yet another example of Ammianus' (often subtle) denigration of Constantius. Here he takes a positive motive (i.e., *pietas*) and portrays it as a far from noble driving force (i.e., *vanitas*).

¹⁵Ammianus (17.4.13) at least knew of Constantine's intention. See also Constantius' inscription on the obelisk's base (quoted below, note 16).

¹⁶It reads: "hoc decus ornatum genitor cognominis urbis esse volens caesa thebis de rupe revellit," ("Constantine's wish was that it should stand in the town known to the world as his namesake; so, with that aim, it was torn from its rock at the temple of Thebai"). See E. Iversen, *Obelisks in Exile*, 2 vols. (Copenhagen, 1968), 1:57–58, for the text and a translation of the entire inscription.

¹⁷Two possibilities exist concerning the confusion over where Constantine intended to place this monolith, Rome or Constantinople: (1) Ammianus was mistaken, or, more likely, wrote that Constantine had intended to bestow the monolith upon Rome in order to steal Constantius' thunder so to speak, as S. Mazzarino, *Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo: Ricerche di storia tardo-romana* (Rome, 1951), 125–26, would have it; (2) Constantius, by informing the Roman populace that he was now making them a gift which his father had intended for Constantinople, sought "to fudge his predecessor's intentions, so as to present his own benefaction in a more

motives, which certainly played a part in the timing of the erection. Indeed, Cyril Mango suggests that Constantius “was anxious to add a further note of theatricality to his triumphal visit to Rome.”¹⁸ By adorning the Circus at Rome in this way Constantius was both reassuring the city of the high esteem in which he held it and providing a monument to himself that would be viewed by a considerable percentage of the citizenry on a regular basis. Indeed, J. Humphrey, noting the exact location of the obelisk (i.e., “very close to the precise centre of the Circus as a whole”¹⁹) and its sheer size (“it was the largest of all the Egyptian obelisks”²⁰), concluded that it “would have made an enormous impression upon the citizens of Rome.”²¹

The fact that first Constantine, and then Constantius, had concentrated so much of their time, wealth, and resources on the creation and embellishment of a Nova Roma; that Constantius had largely neglected Rome, preferring instead to spend his time and resources on Milan; and that Magnentius’ troops had briefly entered the city in order to murder Nepotianus, Constantius’ kinsman, there, all would have left the Romans feeling acutely in need of the reassurance of imperial favor. The addition of a second obelisk to the Circus Maximus not only confirmed Rome’s uniqueness, since no other city in the empire enjoyed a circus possessed of two obelisks,²² but also showed the populace that despite the no doubt bloody reprisals that Constantius inflicted upon supporters of Magnentius’ regime there,²³ they still commanded his favor. Moreover, Constantius had inscribed on the obelisk’s base that Constantine had intended the monolith for Constantinople,²⁴ whereas he had now had it redirected for the pleasure of the people of Rome. In addition, the Roman people would be left with a permanent reminder of his favor and majesty, which would remain with them in the years to come when Constantius would be far away in the East and another pretender to the purple might arise in the West. This was the message implicit in the erection of this monolith. However, in case the sentiment expressed proved too subtle for some, Constantius made it explicit in the final two (of four) inscriptions he had carved on each side of the obelisk’s pediment.

Interea Roman ta[et]ro vastante tyrrano
Augusti iacuit donum studiumque locandi
non fastu sprete sed quod non cederet ullus
tantae molis opus superas consugere in auras

favourable light,” according to G. Fowden, “Nicagoras of Athens and the Lateran Obelisk,” *JHS* 107 (1987): 51–57, esp. 54.

¹⁸“The Columns of Justinian and His Successors,” in C. Mango, *Studies on Constantinople* (Aldershot, 1993), no. X, 1–20, esp. 19.

¹⁹J. Humphrey, *Roman Circuses: Arenas for Chariot Racing* (London, 1986), 288. Similarly, Iversen, *Obelisks*, 1:60: “Constantius had raised it in the middle of the arena directly opposite the imperial box, the *pulvinar*.”

²⁰Humphrey, *Roman Circuses*, 287. Today it weighs 455 tons and stands to a height of 32.15 m, but originally it would have been about a meter taller, a piece having been removed at the time of its reerection in 1586.

²¹*Ibid.*, 288. Cassiodorus, writing in the 6th century, was clearly impressed by both of Rome’s obelisks, which he tells us were “raised to the heights of heaven” (*Variae*, 3.51.8; PL 69.501–880, Eng. trans. S. J. B. Barnish, Cassiodorus: *Variae* [Liverpool, 1992]).

²²Guberti Bassett, “Antiquities,” 93: “while other circuses may have had a single obelisk, only Rome was distinguished by two: the Heliopolitan Obelisk donated by Augustus and the Theban Obelisk erected by Constantius.”

²³See Ammianus, 14.5.1 ff, although allowance must be made for exaggeration on the author’s part.

²⁴See above, note 16.

ample of an Imperial Roman/Early Christian mausoleum,"³⁰ has recently been attributed to Constantius by W. Eugene Kleinbauer.³¹

It is also possible that a good many of the building works attributed to Constantine by our major sources were in fact the work of Constantius. Several factors may have led to various constructions being dubbed Constantinian as opposed to Constantian. For example, orthodox ecclesiastical writers may have preferred to attribute a work to an emperor they perceived as orthodox (i.e., Constantine) rather than one they deemed to be Arian (i.e., Constantius), while R. Davis has noted that the manuscript tradition of the *Liber Pontificalis*, our *Hauptquelle* for imperial building benefactions in Rome, frequently confuses the names of Constantine and his sons.³²

Ammianus' depiction of Constantius' visit to Rome reveals that emperor's positive attitude toward imperial monuments. However, one must turn to the eastern capital in order to see what could result from this attitude when Constantius had more than thirty days at his disposal. For at Constantinople this passion was combined with a profound sense of *pietas*, the result being an extensive building program that saw Constantius not only completing those works his father had initiated but adding others of his own. Indeed, as one contemporary puts it: "You [i.e., Constantius] did not merely guard unharmed your father's sacred trust, but you made it manifold and increased it, nor did you merely assent to possess the things which came from him, but you added many things of your own, and you struggled emulously in this fair contest, with the founder, as to which of you should outrun the other in benefactions."³³

Regrettably, it is almost impossible to isolate and identify precisely what form these numerous benefactions took. Constantius' building projects in Constantinople, as in Rome, are frequently lumped together and generalized by our sources, receiving no individual treatment. The result is that it is difficult for modern scholars to re-create the general impression of Constantius' considerable embellishment of both the imperial palace³⁴ and the city as a whole (through statues, porticoes, colonnades, fountains, and façades)³⁵ that must have confronted contemporaries.

Other factors also make an assessment of Constantius' building program in Constantinople problematic. For example, in the case of the Horrea Constantiaca, there exists no evidence, other than its name, to suggest that this harbor facility was built by Constantius.³⁶ Furthermore, certain works are deliberately attributed to other emperors be-

³⁰D. J. Stanley, "New Discoveries at Santa Constanza," *DOP* 48 (1994): 257–61, esp. 257.

³¹"The Anastasis Rotunda and Christian Architectural Invention," *Journal of the Centre for Jewish Art* 23/24 (1988): 140–46, who asks, "did Constantius, who had recently transferred his principal residence from Antioch to Milan, arrange for the transport of the body of his oldest sister from Bithynia to Rome, and did he direct the replacement of the small triconch alongside S. Agnese with the present mausoleum as a sepulchre more befitting her?" (143).

³²R. Davis, *The Book of the Pontiffs* (Liverpool, 1989), xx.

³³Themistios, *Oratio* 3.47b, G. Downey and A. F. Norman, eds., *Themistii Orationes*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1965–74).

³⁴On Constantius' embellishment of the palace at Constantinople, see C. Mango, *The Brazen House* (Copenhagen, 1959), 22, esp. n. 7.

³⁵See G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale* (Paris, 1974), 89: "il est certain que Constance compléta et acheva le décor de la cité mis en place par son père: murs d'enceinte, portiques, fontaines"; and A. Piganiol, *l'empire chrétien*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1972), 116–17.

³⁶See C. Mango, "The Development of Constantinople as an Urban Centre," in *The 17th International Byzantine Congress, Major Papers* (New York, 1986), 117–36, esp. 121.

cause of the religious prejudices of our sources. For instance, the orthodox Christian sources attribute nearly all of Constantinople's early churches to Constantine, hence the conflicting accounts found in the literary evidence concerning the construction of the church of the Holy Apostles which have resulted in much modern debate as to whether it was Constantine, Constantius, or both, who built this church.³⁷ Similarly, our pagan sources prefer to allot certain Constantinopolitan constructions to Julian. Most notable among these are a harbor and curved stoa leading to it, both of which Zosimos attributes to Julian,³⁸ but which, given the length of his reign and his single, extremely brief stay in the city,³⁹ perhaps ought to be assigned on grounds of probability to the twenty-four-year reign of Constantius.

There are, of course, other problems facing those seeking certainty as to the "authorship" of a particular construction. For example, even when our sources single out a specific building project, the archaeological⁴⁰ methods at our disposal are often of little or no avail when it comes to identifying whether a building or monument was erected by Constantine or was the work of his son and successor. Needless to say, the question of what proportion of a work was initiated by Constantine and what proportion was continued and completed by Constantius proves even more problematic. Finally, again as with the case of Rome, scrutiny of the manuscript tradition of the literary evidence shows the Greek sources to be no more reliable in distinguishing between Constantine and his sons palaeographically.

This having been said, let us begin by looking at those specific secular works claimed by our sources to have been undertaken by Constantius. These, unlike Constantinople's ecclesiastical buildings, are comparatively easy to identify as having been the work of that particular emperor. The sole references to these are found in three works that seldom receive the attention they deserve: the *Chronicon Paschale*, Themistios' Orations 3 and 4, and Julian's first panegyric on Constantius. The first informs us that during the consulship of Amantius and Albinus (345) "the building of the Thermae Constantianae in Constantinople near the Apostles was begun by Constantius, from day 17 of the month of April." (In the event, these baths, southeast of the church of the Holy Apostles, were not completed until the reign of Theodosios II,⁴¹ at which point they were renamed the Theodosianae.⁴²) Themistios both corroborates what the *Chronicon Paschale* tells us about the Thermae Constantianae and informs us of other building projects undertaken by Constantius: "Thus it is right that while tripling his realm he [Constantius] increases the

³⁷See below, pp. 287 ff.

³⁸Zosimos, *Historia nova*, ed. L. Mendelssohn (Leipzig, 1887), 3.11.3. Zosimos' work is perhaps better described as pagan hagiography rather than history, which leads him to deny the Constantinian dynasty any responsibility for prestigious building projects in the eastern capital; the credit for them is instead transferred to Julian the Apostate. Hence Zosimos also attributes the Constantinopolitan library to Julian, despite the explicit testimony of a contemporary which credits Constantius with building it (see below, pp. 284 f).

³⁹Julian wintered at Constantinople in 361/62 while passing through on his way to Antioch.

⁴⁰The excavation of modern Istanbul is almost impossible given its massive population and the extent to which it is built up. Moreover, modern religious sensibilities require bearing in mind; the site of the Holy Apostles, for example, is currently occupied by the Fatih Camii, making excavation an impossibility.

⁴¹3 October 427, to be precise.

⁴²*Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, 2 vols, CSHB 1832; Eng. trans. M. and M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 A.D.* (Liverpool, 1989), s.a. 427.

City which is of the same age as his imperial power, not extending the circuit wall, but contriving to add something to the City's beauty, both seeking more abundant springs of water, and building baths which bear his name (whose size you can now see,⁴³ while it is expected that their beauty will match their size) and encircling the City with a covered colonnade like a luxurious girdle, and creating the royal market place like a headdress woven of gold and ornamental strips."⁴⁴ A little later, in the same oration, Themistios adds that Constantius also founded a public library at the eastern capital.⁴⁵ As G. Dagron suggests, he perhaps built this at the time he was establishing Constantinople's imperial scriptorium.⁴⁶ Moreover, Constantius appointed an overseer to ensure the copying of precious manuscripts.⁴⁷ Unfortunately, the details surrounding Constantius' provisions for this Constantinopolitan library remain sketchy, and H.-G. Beck is surely correct to add a note of caution in asking "whether the activity of the scriptorium was as expansive as Themistios tries to insinuate" and whether "it was a public library or only a treasury of books, where now and then an emperor could enter and feel bookish."⁴⁸

Finally, Julian, in his first panegyric to the emperor, writes: "As to your benefactions to the city of your ancestors [i.e., Constantinople], you built round it a wall that was then only begun, and all buildings that seemed to be unsound you restored and made safe for all time."⁴⁹ Julian's assertion that part of Constantius' energies had to be spent reconstructing certain buildings is supported by Zosimos' statement that "some [structures] he [Constantine] built were shortly after pulled down, being unsafe owing to their hasty construction."⁵⁰

In addition to the buildings mentioned above, it is evident that Constantius adorned the city with statues. (This penchant for statues he evidently inherited from his father, who, we are told, had erected "a great statue of himself with rays of light on his head, a work in bronze which he had brought from Phrygia,"⁵¹ a pair of statues representing the Dioscuri,⁵² a statue of "Rhea, mother of the gods, and . . . of *Fortuna Romae*,"⁵³ and numerous other unspecified pieces.⁵⁴) In particular, both these emperors, and some of their successors, made significant contributions to the Hippodrome's statuary.⁵⁵ Nor were the

⁴³The foundations of these baths must already have been laid at the time this oration was delivered (probably on 1 January 357) if the size of them could be seen.

⁴⁴*Or.* 4.58b–c. The translation is that of J. Vanderspoel, *Themistios and the Imperial Court* (Michigan, 1995), 79.

⁴⁵*Or.* 4.59d–61d. In addition, see J. Vanderspoel, "The 'Themistios Collection' of Commentaries on Plato and Aristotle," *Phoenix* 43 (1989): 162–64.

⁴⁶Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale*, 89.

⁴⁷Themistios, *Or.* 4.60a: καὶ τάττει μὲν ἄρχοντα ἐπὶ τῷ ἔργῳ.

⁴⁸"Constantinople: The Rise of a New Capital in the East," in *Age of Spirituality: A Symposium*, ed. K. Weitzmann (New York, 1980), 29–37, at 33 and 34 respectively.

⁴⁹*Or.* 1.41a.

⁵⁰Zosimos, 2.32.

⁵¹*Chron. Pasch.* s.a. 328.

⁵²Zosimos, 2.31.1.

⁵³Zosimos, 2.31.2.

⁵⁴*Chron. Pasch.* s.a. 328; John Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. L. Dindorf, CSHB (1831); Eng. trans. E. Jeffreys, *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, Byzantina Australiensia 4 (Melbourne, 1986), 13.8. See also C. Mango, "Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder," *DOP* 17 (1958): 55–75.

⁵⁵See Guberti Bassett, "Antiquities," 88: "In addition to completing the Hippodrome's structure, Constantine initiated the first systematic ornamentation of the site. This project appears to have been incomplete

statues in question simply commissioned indiscriminately by Constantine and Constantius from local artisans. Instead, they were imported from Rome and were the works of the great sculptors of antiquity.⁵⁶ Previously they had adorned the Circus Maximus and other highly significant locations; now they decorated places of corresponding importance at the eastern capital. As well as providing Constantinople with the splendor necessary to surpass that of any other city of the Greek East,⁵⁷ its embellishment with these objets d'art was motivated by political considerations. The *Chronicon Paschale* leaves its readers in no doubt that Constantine had modeled the Hippodrome of his New Rome on that of the Old Rome's Circus Maximus: "he [Constantine] also completed the Hippodrome, adorning it with works of bronze and with every excellence, and made in it a box for imperial viewing in the likeness of the one which is in Rome."⁵⁸ Thus S. Guberti Bassett, after acknowledging that "one of the very basic aims in the requisitioning of statuary must have been to make the place look like its Roman prototype," concludes that "by using ancient monuments as decoration, the Hippodrome acquired a patina of age and respectability that an essentially fourth-century (i.e., modern) building would have lacked."⁵⁹ Later she adds, "no other Circus in the Roman world incorporated so many images of Rome with such consistency as to proclaim itself unequivocally a New Rome."⁶⁰

Constantius also clearly appreciated the importance of statuary. He, like his father,⁶¹ removed great works of art from other cities in the East, embellishing Constantinople with them. For example, the (admittedly rather unreliable) *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* states that Constantius brought statues of Perseus and Andromeda to Constantinople from Iconium. These statues he had erected ἐν τῷ Κωνσταντιναῖς λουτρῷ.⁶² It also appears that Constantius may have continued his father's practice of adorning Nova Roma with works from its elder sister, since it was possibly (even probably) he who removed the colossal bronze of Herakles,⁶³ attributed to Lysippos of Sikyon (4th century B.C.), from the Capitol to Constantinople. It had previously adorned the acropolis of Tarentum, but was removed to Rome in 209 B.C. when the city was recaptured by the Romans following

at his death, and the decoration of the arena was carried on by subsequent emperors, among them Constantius, Theodosius I, Arcadius, and Theodosius II." For the evidence concerning Constantinopolitan statuary, see Averil Cameron and J. Herrin, eds., *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* (Leiden, 1984), text and commentary.

⁵⁶For example, the statue of Herakles by Lysippos of Sikyon (see below).

⁵⁷That Constantine was acutely aware of the competition provided by other older and more decorated cities in the East is demonstrated by the numerous complaints of pagan writers that he stripped these cities and in particular their temples of their objets d'art in order to embellish Constantinople. See Eunapios, *Vitae Sophistarum*, Eng. trans. W. C. Wright in *Philostratus and Eunapius: The Lives of the Sophists*, Loeb Classical Library (LCL) (London, 1922), 462; Libanios, *Libanios Opera*, ed. R. Foerster (Leipzig, 1921), *Or.* 1.202, 30.37, 70.4 *Ep.* 252; Julian, Eng. trans. W. C. Wright in *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, 3 vols. LCL (London, 1913–1923), *Or.* 1.41a; and Claudius, *Claudian*, 2 vols. Eng. trans. M. Platnauer, LCL (New York, 1922), *Bell. Gild.* 1.58 f.

⁵⁸S.a. 328, trans. M. and M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 A.D.* (Liverpool, 1989).

⁵⁹Guberti Bassett, "Antiquities," 93.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, 95, adding that "while obelisks and imperial statuary existed in other circuses, the presence of uniquely Roman monuments was unknown elsewhere."

⁶¹See Zosimos, 5.25.6 for some of the art treasures Constantine had removed from other eastern cities, e.g., the statues of Zeus from Dodona and Athena from Lindos.

⁶²*Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. T. Preger (Leipzig, 1901–7), p. 73, chap. 85.

⁶³The statue depicted Herakles sitting down resting after having cleaned the Augean stables.

its defection to Hannibal. The work must have been singularly impressive to have been deemed worthy of occupying two such prestigious locations within two such prestigious cities as these. Although it cannot be shown beyond doubt that Constantius was responsible for this statue's removal, the *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* relates how it was brought to Constantinople from Rome in the consulship of Julian.⁶⁴ According to R. S. Bagnall and Alan Cameron,⁶⁵ the consulship was held by a Julian only six times in late antiquity, three of them during Constantius' reign. The first of these occurred in 322 when Anicius Julianus was consul in the West. However, since this predates the foundation of Constantinople by two years, it can be rejected. The next consulship is that of Julius Iulianus in 325. This is the date that Guberti Bassett prefers⁶⁶ (although she ignores the possibly pertinent fact that Constantinople had not even been dedicated by 325). Then occur the consulships of the Caesar Julian in 356, 357, and 360, which Guberti Bassett rejects as "unlikely" since Julian was a pagan and therefore would not have had the statue removed from Rome.⁶⁷ Guberti Bassett, however, clearly misunderstands the nature of Julian's position at this time if she thinks that he could have disobeyed an order from Constantius to send the work to Constantinople,⁶⁸ an order the emperor may have issued in 357 or (even 360) after having no doubt seen the statue during his visit to Rome. Julian's consulship while augustus in 363 provides the last possible consular date. However, I agree with Guberti Bassett that in 363 Julian would probably not have removed the statue from Rome. The date of the removal of this statue, then, can be chosen more plausibly from the years 325, 356, 357, and 360, with the last three dates occurring during Constantius' rule. Although all of these dates are possible, their distribution suggests that the removal of the statue is more likely to have occurred under Constantius. I offer the suggestion, therefore, that Constantius saw the statue while in Rome in 357 and thought it so impressive as to have it removed the same year to adorn Constantinople.

Finally, with regard to Constantius' secular building program at the eastern capital, it is evident from Julian's *Letter to the Alexandrians* that Constantius had intended to provide the city with an obelisk: "I am informed that there is in your neighbourhood a granite obelisk which, when it stood erect, reached a considerable height, but has been thrown down and lies on the beach as though it were something entirely worthless. For this obelisk Constantius of blessed memory had a freight-boat built, because he intended to convey it to my native place, Constantinople. But since by the will of heaven he departed from this life to the next on that journey to which we are fated, the city claims the monument from me because it is the place of my birth and more closely connected with me than with the late emperor. For though he loved the place as a sister, I love it as my mother."⁶⁹ Julian does not say who had removed the monolith to Alexandria (from its original location at Thebes). However, he appears to imply that Constantius was responsible solely for the preparations to ship the monument from Alexandria to Constanti-

⁶⁴Chap. 37. It must be emphasized, however, that the *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* is a rather unreliable work.

⁶⁵*Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta, Ga., 1987), 178, 246–49, 254–55.

⁶⁶Guberti Bassett, "Antiquities," 90 n. 35.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Julian had no authority in Rome until late 361.

⁶⁹*Ep.* 48. All translations of Julian's works are by W. C. Wright, *Julian*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1923). The obelisk referred to originally honored Tuthmosis III.

nople, in which case one of Constantius' predecessors must have brought the obelisk down the Nile. A likely candidate would be Constantine, whom we know from Ammianus⁷⁰ to have moved at least one obelisk from Thebes to Alexandria. With regard to Constantius, J. Humphrey plausibly suggests that "having raised an obelisk in the circus of the ancient city, Constantius had intended, as a parallel gesture, to erect a corresponding monument in the new capital of the empire."⁷¹ E. Iversen goes one step further, arguing that the Constantinopolitan monolith, like its Roman counterpart, was intended by Constantius as a triumphal monument celebrating his victory over Magnentius.⁷² In any event, the obelisk was finally erected in 390, when Theodosios had it set up in the Hippodrome.⁷³

I now turn to Constantius' contribution to ecclesiastical building in the eastern capital. Regrettably, the lack of any original remains has meant that archaeologists and students of ancient architecture are unable to distinguish between those buildings constructed by Constantine and those that were the work of his son. This is especially unfortunate since the literary evidence is often confused on these matters. We possess references to only two churches having been built in Constantinople by Constantius—the church of the Holy Apostles and St. Sophia—and both of these are attributed to Constantine by other ancient writers.

Concerning the church of the Holy Apostles, Eusebios of Caesarea,⁷⁴ Paulinus of Nola,⁷⁵ Socrates,⁷⁶ Sozomen,⁷⁷ and a host of much later Byzantine chroniclers⁷⁸ attribute its construction to Constantine. However, Philostorgios,⁷⁹ Prokopios,⁸⁰ Constantine of Rhodes,⁸¹ Nicholas Mesarites,⁸² Symeon Metaphrastes,⁸³ and the Synaxarion of Constantinople⁸⁴ all state that Constantius erected the church. The problem is compounded by mention of Constantine's mausoleum which appears to have comprised part of the

⁷⁰ Ammianus, 17.4.13.

⁷¹ *Roman Circuses*, 11.

⁷² *Obelisks*, 2:12–13.

⁷³ Marcellinus Comes, under the third indiction, consulship of Valentinian Augustus (4th) and Neotenius. See B. Croke, *The Chronicle of Marcellinus* (Sydney, 1995), 4, 61. See also R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine: Développement urbain et répertoire topographique* (Paris, 1964), 189–91; S. Rebenich, "Zum Theodosiusobelisken in Konstantinopel," *IstMitt* 41 (1991): 447–76.

⁷⁴ *Vita Constantini*, ed. F. Winkelman, GCS (Berlin, 1975), 4.58–60, 70–71.

⁷⁵ *Carmina* 19.329–42, in CSEL 30, p. 130.

⁷⁶ Socrates, 1.16.

⁷⁷ Sozomen, 2.34.

⁷⁸ Most notably Theophanes, A.M. 5816, vol. 1, p. 23, 30 ff, ed. C. De Boor; George the Monk, *Georgius Monarchus: Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, rev. P. Wirth (Stuttgart, 1978), p. 501, 2–4, ed. De Boor; *Leo the Grammarian*, *Chronographia* CSHB (Bonn, 1842), pp. 87, 19–21, and 89, 2–7, Bonn ed. and others. See G. Downey, "The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople," *DOP* 6 (1951): 53–80, for a complete list of these other authors, many of whom simply copied the works of their predecessors listed above.

⁷⁹ Philostorgios, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez, rev. J. Winkelman, GCS (Stuttgart, 1972), 3.2. See also *Artemii passio*, ed. P. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 5 (Berlin, 1988), 185–245 (18) and Zonaras, *Annales*, ed. M. Pinder et al., 3 vols., CSHB (Bonn, 1841–1897) (13.4.28), both of whom in all probability were drawing on Philostorgios here.

⁸⁰ *De Aedificiis*, *Procopius*, Eng. trans. H. B. Dewing, 7 vols., LCL (London, 1954), 1.4.19.

⁸¹ In his description of the *Wonders of Constantinople*, line 477 (which appears on fol. 143v of the unique manuscript of Constantine).

⁸² Text and translation in G. Downey, *TAPS*, n.s., 47 (1957): 859–924.

⁸³ *Martyrium S. Artemii*, 8, PG 115:1169; *Vita S. Timothei*, 3, 11–12, PG 114:772 B–C.

⁸⁴ *Synaxarium CP*, 22 January, p. 412, 16–33.

church of the Holy Apostles. Again, two rival source traditions arose, with some authors attributing its construction to Constantine,⁸⁵ others to Constantius.⁸⁶ G. Downey, in his magisterial article on the subject, undertook a comprehensive survey of the sources available and concluded that the source traditions that attribute the building of the mausoleum and the church of the Holy Apostles to Constantius should be preferred to those that attribute them to Constantine.⁸⁷

With regard to the church itself, Downey argued that the passage in the *Vita Constantini* that attributes the construction of these two edifices to Constantine is a later interpolation.⁸⁸ After noting that several passages in the work appear to have been added at a later date—a view shared by many earlier scholars⁸⁹—he argued that this passage in particular looks suspect because it states that “it is possible even now (καὶ νῦν) to see” the church of the Holy Apostles.⁹⁰ This phrase was not only a “stock motif of popular chronicles and edifying works, in which it was used rather naively, in order to lend verisimilitude to tales designed for simple audiences,”⁹¹ but it was, furthermore, wholly inappropriate given its context. As Eusebios died before 340 (probably in May 339), it would appear odd at the very least that he should comment that the church could “even now” be seen.⁹² Downey, having dismissed the *Hauptquelle* for Constantine having built the Holy Apostles, then moves on to discuss the merits of the alternative source tradition, which names Constantius as the church’s builder. Philostorgios, he admits, was pro-Arian and drew on a pro-Arian source, which led him “to glorify Constantius.”⁹³ Thus Downey concedes that Philostorgios’ testimony is far from unimpeachable.⁹⁴ (Downey does well to note, however, that otherwise Philostorgios’ credentials are impressive: he moved to Constantinople in the 380s and therefore “could have made himself familiar with the history of the Church of the Apostles”⁹⁵). Regarding the testimonies of Prokopios, Constantine of Rhodes, and Nicholas Mesarites, Downey concluded that these three authors “wrote under official auspices, had an intimate knowledge of the building, which they described for its own sake, and must have been familiar with the commemorative building inscription which the building undoubtedly contained.”⁹⁶ Thus, stated Downey,

⁸⁵ I.e., Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez, rev. G. C. Hanson, GCS 50 (Berlin, 1960), (2.34.7–8) and the *Patria Constantinoupoleos*, ed. T. Preger, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanum* (Leipzig, 1907), 140, 9–14.

⁸⁶ Namely, Philostorgios (3.2), *Nikolaos Mesarites: Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber* 9 (Graz, 1958) (chaps. 1 and 39), and Zonaras (13.4.28), who was perhaps drawing on Philostorgios here.

⁸⁷ “The Builder of the Original Church of the Holy Apostles,” *DOP* 6 (1951): 53–80.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, esp. 58–65.

⁸⁹ Most notably, G. Pasquali, “Die Composition der *Vita Constantini* des Eusebios,” *Hermes* 45 (1910): 369–86; J. Maurice, *BullSocAntFr* (1913): 387–96, and *ibid.* (1919): 154–55; O. Stählin, in W. Schmid and Stählin’s revision of Wilhelm von Christ’s *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 6th ed., vol. 2. 2 (Munich, 1924), 1369; H. Grégoire, “Eusèbe n’est pas l’auteur de la ‘*Vita Constantini*’ dans sa forme actuelle et Constantin ne s’est pas ‘converti’ en 312,” *Byzantion* 13 (1938): 561–83; but see Downey, “The Builder,” 62–64, for a full survey of modern scholars who share similar views.

⁹⁰ *Vita Const.* 4.71: ὡς ὁρᾶν ἔστι εἰσεῖναι καὶ νῦν τὸ μὲν τῆς τρισμακαρίας ψυχῆς σκῆνος

⁹¹ Downey, “The Builder,” 58.

⁹² *Ibid.* For the date of Eusebios’ death, see below, p. 289 n. 109.

⁹³ Downey, “The Builder,” 66.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 69.

“it seems beyond question that the Church of the Holy Apostles was built by Constantius”⁹⁷—a conclusion that has found widespread,⁹⁸ although not universal,⁹⁹ acceptance, most notably by Mango.¹⁰⁰

On the other hand, Downey’s conclusion that Constantine’s mausoleum was the work of Constantius¹⁰¹ has met with less support. Eleven years after Downey’s article appeared, P. Grierson, while upholding the former’s conclusion that “the church of the Apostles was built by Constantius,”¹⁰² challenged the notion that it was Constantius who had built Constantine’s mausoleum: “it is incredible that an emperor with such a passion for building [i.e., Constantine] should have neglected to undertake what was, after all, a normal imperial activity.”¹⁰³ More recently, Mango echoed this view, writing that Constantine’s construction of his own mausoleum “would have been the normal thing to have done.”¹⁰⁴ He continues: “Constantine’s immediate predecessors and several members of his family had put up magnificent mausolea for themselves, using . . . the same architectural formula. Would not he have done likewise?”¹⁰⁵ This, I think, is correct, although it has to be admitted that an argument that is based on likelihood (as this one must be, given the nature of the source material¹⁰⁶) can never be conclusive.

Finally, concerning Constantius’ ecclesiastical building at Constantinople, there re-

⁹⁷Ibid. and similarly on p. 80.

⁹⁸A. E. R. Boak, review of G. Downey, *Speculum* 28 (1953): 155–58; R. J. H. Jenkins, review of G. Downey, *JHS* 73 (1953): 192; D. J. Geanakoplos, “Church Building and ‘Caesaropapism,’ A.D. 312–565,” *GRBS* 7 (1966): 167–86, esp. 176 n. 33.

⁹⁹Note the dissenting voice of R. Krautheimer, “Zur Konstantins Apostelkirche in Konstantinopel,” in *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser* (Munster, 1964), 224–29, English trans. in idem, *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval, and Renaissance Art* (London-New York, 1971), 27–34; idem, *Three Christian Capitals* (Berkeley, Calif., 1983), 58 and 138 n. 26.

¹⁰⁰C. Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople* (Paris, 1985), 27; idem, “Constantine’s Mausoleum and the Translation of the Relics,” *BZ* 83 (1990): 51–61, esp. 57 ff. See also Dagron, *Naissance d’une capitale*, 401–5. Dagron appears to suggest that Constantine began work on the Holy Apostles, but that the transferral of the relics of Sts. Timothy, Andrew, and Luke there in 359 by Constantius brought about “un changement complet dans la conception du monument, et inaugure peut-être une modification architecturale importante” (405).

¹⁰¹Downey, “The Builder,” 56–57, and 77.

¹⁰²P. Grierson, “The Tombs and Obits of Byzantine Emperors,” *DOP* 16 (1962): 1–65, esp. 5.

¹⁰³Ibid.

¹⁰⁴C. Mango, “Constantine’s Mausoleum and the Translation of the Relics,” *BZ* 83 (1990): 51–61, esp. 57.

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

¹⁰⁶Those sources which state that Constantine built the mausoleum include: *Vita Constantini*, ed. F. Winkelman, GCS (Berlin, 1975), 4.70–71; Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* (hereafter *HE*), ed. R. Hussey, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1853), 1.40; Sozomen, *HE* 2.34.5; *Theodoros Anagnostes Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. C. Hansen, Griechische Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Neue Folge, Bd. 3 (Berlin, 1995), 27; Prokopios, *De Aedificiis*, 1.4.9; while Philostorgios, *HE* 3.2 (and his dependent Zonaras) attribute it to Constantius. Julian’s statement (*Or.* 1.16c–d) that Constantius “adorned his [Constantine’s] tomb (τάφον) not only by lavishing on it splendid decorations” has been employed both by Downey (“The Builder,” 77) to argue “that at the time when Julian spoke, Constantius had already built the mausoleum but had not yet built the church” and by Grierson (“The Tombs,” 5) to argue that the tomb had therefore been the work of his father. In short, Julian’s statement is inconclusive, and in any case may have been a τόπος—a consideration that appears to have escaped both Downey and Grierson—given that it appears to have been borrowed from Isocrates’ *Evagoras*, which Julian employed as a template for this panegyric on Constantius. (Cf. *Isocrates*, Eng. trans. G. Norlin, 3 vols., LCL (New York, 1928–1945), *Evag.* 1, ‘Ορῶν, ὦ Νικόκλεις, τιμῶντά σε τὸν τάφον τοῦ πατρὸς οὐ μόνον τῷ πλήθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει τῶν ἐπιφερομένων, with Julian, *Or.* 1.16c–d: οὐ μόνον τῷ πλήθει καὶ κάλλει τῶν ἐπενεχθέντων τὸν τάφον ἐκόμεις.

mains to be discussed the original church of St. Sophia,¹⁰⁷ or the Great Church as it was frequently styled. Again our sources are in disagreement as to whether Constantine or Constantius was the founder. This time, however, the case for Constantius having constructed the church is far stronger. For a start, Eusebios makes no mention of the building, a silence that in itself could be taken to imply that work on it had not begun before his death¹⁰⁸ (some point before 340¹⁰⁹). Furthermore, all the authors who attribute the building of St. Sophia to Constantine were writing considerably later than the fourth century.¹¹⁰ George Kedrenos, perhaps in an attempt to reconcile the differing accounts in his sources, wrote that Constantine left instructions for the building of the Great Church with his son who subsequently built and consecrated it.¹¹¹ Similarly, some modern scholars have sought to reconcile the conflicting accounts of our sources by suggesting that “it is possible that Constantine laid the foundations of St. Sophia, which was completed by his successor, Constantius.”¹¹² Such a reconciliation is, however, unnecessary, since the tradition that attributes the building of the church solely to Constantius is earlier and ultimately stronger. Indeed, the earliest source to discuss the construction of St. Sophia (as opposed to merely its consecration) is Socrates,¹¹³ who was writing approximately seventy years after the church’s consecration¹¹⁴ (on 15 February 360¹¹⁵), and who informs us that Constantius was responsible for it. In addition, Philostorgios, admittedly a pro-Constantian writer, also states that Constantius was responsible for the building of St. Sophia.¹¹⁶ Consequently, both Mango¹¹⁷ and Dagron¹¹⁸ have attributed the Great Church to Constantine’s son, the latter concluding that “la première Sainte-Sophie est l’oeuvre de Constance.”¹¹⁹ In any case, as Mary and Michael Whitby have observed, “the

¹⁰⁷This was burned to the ground on 20 June 404, only forty-four years after its consecration, during the turmoil that ensued from John Chrysostom’s expulsion. See Socrates, *HE* 6.18.18–17; and *Chron. Pasch.* s.a. 404).

¹⁰⁸This is, admittedly, an *argumentum e silentio*.

¹⁰⁹E. Schwartz, “Eusebios,” *RE* 6:1434. See also G. Pasquali, “Die Composition der Vita Constantin des Eusebios,” *Hermes* 45 (1910): 386, who puts his death in May 338. He is followed by J. Maurice, *BullSocAntFr* (1913): 387 n. 2. However, more recently T. D. Barnes, in his *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), has argued convincingly for a date of May 339 (p. 263) and has been followed by Av. Cameron and S. G. Hall in their new edition of the *Vita Constantini*, entitled *Eusebius: Life of Constantine* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 3, 9, and 10.

¹¹⁰I.e., the *Narratio de St. Sophia*, 1 (*Patria*, ed. Preger, 74.6–8); George the Monk (2.627.4–5); and George Kedrenos (1.498.3). The first was written by Paul the Silentiary and delivered either at the rededication of the church on 24 December 562 or a few days later at Epiphany (6 February 563), while George the Monk wrote during the 840s and Kedrenos ca. 1100.

¹¹¹Kedrenos, 1.523.4–7.

¹¹²A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire 324–1453*, 2d ed. (Oxford, 1952), 53. Similarly, Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals*, 53.

¹¹³Socrates, *HE* 2.16.

¹¹⁴On the date of composition of Socrates’ *Ecclesiastical History*, see Alan Cameron, “The Empress and the Poet: Paganism and Politics at the Court of Theodosius II,” *YCS* 27 (1982): 217–89, esp. 265–67. F. Geppert, *Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Socrates Scholasticus*, Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche 3.4 (Leipzig, 1889), 4–9, argued for simply between 439 and 444.

¹¹⁵*Chron. Pasch.* s.a. 360; *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana*, ed. and trans. R. W. Burgess (Oxford, 1993), s.a. 360.

¹¹⁶Philostorgios, 3.2.

¹¹⁷*The Brazen House*, 51.

¹¹⁸*Naissance d’une capitale*, 397–99.

¹¹⁹*Ibid.*, 399.

completion of the Great Church, together with the appointment of a city prefect in 359, was an indication that the new city of Constantinople had now developed into a major urban centre.”¹²⁰ And so, at the exact same time Julian was being proclaimed at Paris, Constantius was putting the final touches to his father’s dreams of creating a Christian capital of the East to rival pagan Rome.

Thus far, Constantius’ building activities appear to have been motivated by a deep-seated sense of filial *pietas* and, in the case of the ecclesiastical works, a desire to be seen as a “good Christian emperor” as opposed to merely a *bonus princeps*. While the projects treated above, both at Rome and Constantinople, may be viewed as deriving from either *pietas* or piety or both, Constantius’ embellishment of Antioch betrays a genuine love for monumental structures. At Constantinople, most of the construction work, though imperially funded, was probably carried out (at least after 359) under the direction of the city’s prefect.¹²¹ Constantius, it must be noted, is attested at Constantinople on only five occasions throughout his twenty-four-year reign as augustus, wintering there perhaps only three times.¹²² The emperor, while in the East, preferred to winter instead at Antioch, which he did most years from 337 to 350 and again in 360/61.¹²³ Antioch had been the command headquarters for the eastern front for centuries. In the late third and early fourth centuries, first Diocletian and then Galerius had used it as a base of operations against Persia. Subsequently, Constantine, and more recently Constantius¹²⁴ and Gallus, had directed their eastern campaigns from Antioch, as both Julian and Valens were later to do. The importance of this city was confirmed by the concentration of officials to be found there, which included, in addition to the emperor, the *magister militum per Orientem*, the *comes Orientis*, and the *consularis Syriae*.

If we begin by examining Constantius’ secular building works at Antioch, we can see that he concerned himself with both practical and cosmetic undertakings. On the practical side, he built a harbor at Seleucia Pieria in 346.¹²⁵ The primary aim of this construc-

¹²⁰Whitby and Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale*, 34 n. 107. Dagron, of course, has argued convincingly that the existence of a city prefect and a senate of its own meant that Constantinople was not merely a “major urban center” but an imperial capital.

¹²¹This, indeed, was common practice even at Antioch where the emperor was resident. Julian, *Or.* 1.41a informs us that adornments to the city were made by Constantius through Antioch’s governors. See also J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch* (Oxford, 1972), 135 n. 3, who, citing Libanios, *Or.* 11.194, concludes that “at this time (under Constantius) governors received imperial subsidies for public works at Antioch.” (In addition, see W. K. Prentice, “Officials Charged with the Conduct of Public Works in Roman and Byzantine Syria,” *TAPA* 43 (1912): 113–23.) This practice must account for Constantinople’s embellishment during the long years of Constantius’ absence from the capital.

¹²²See T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), app. 9. Constantius perhaps wintered at the eastern capital in 343/44, 349/50, and 359/60.

¹²³Ibid. See Libanios, *Or.* 11.180: “Indeed, he [Constantius] has not gone elsewhere, except in so far as warfare has compelled him to, but in truth has spent the pleasantest part of his time here [in Antioch], taking his pleasure as though in the arms of a loved one.” See also the *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, ed. Jean Rougé (Paris, 1966), SC 124 (chap. 23): “there is Antioch, the first regal city, good in all things, where the lord of the universe [i.e., Constantius] has his seat” (similarly, chap. 32: “since the emperor has there [i.e., Antioch] his seat”).

¹²⁴See Libanios, *Or.* 11.179: “wherefore, the Persians blame us especially among their enemies because we provide this city as a base of operations which rivals the warlike prowess of the emperor, and we have nowhere diminished his eager courage by any deficiency of the help which we supply.”

¹²⁵Seleucia Pieria was to Antioch what Ostia was to Rome and the Piraeus was to Athens. For the date, see Jerome, *Chronicle*, s.a. 346 and a host of chroniclers dependent on him (i.e., Theophanes and his dependent

tion must have been to facilitate the movement of men, supplies, and equipment from all parts of the empire to Antioch in preparation for coming campaigns against the Persians. Indeed Libanios, in his oration on Antioch delivered in 360, writes:

When this last Persian war was unchained, for which the Persian government had been preparing for a long time, and when the emergency called for adequate counter preparation to match the threat, and, even more than for preparations, called for a place capable of receiving all those things that such a war requires, this land of ours is the one that rose above the emergency with its abundance and collected the forces to its bosom and sent forth the entire army, when the time called. For there flowed to it, like rivers to the sea, all the soldiers, all the bowmen and horsemen and the horses, both those of the fighting men and those carrying burdens, and every camel and every band of soldiers, so that the ground was covered with men standing and men sitting; the walls were covered with shields hung up and spears and helmets were to be seen everywhere; everything resounded with hammering and whinnying, and there were so many units stationed here that their officers alone would have added no small population to the city, or rather such a great army was gathered that in other places the drinking water would have been exhausted.¹²⁶

Moreover, the previous year (late 359), the troops that Julian in Gaul was requested by Constantius to send for the summer offensive against Sapor almost certainly would have traveled by sea and disembarked at Seleucia. In addition, G. Downey writes that “aside from its military importance, this new harbour also contributed materially to the economic prosperity of the city, by providing improved opportunities for travel and communications and for the movement of goods.”¹²⁷ Indeed Julian, writing in 355, says of Antioch: “Her existence she does indeed owe to her founder [i.e., Antiochus], but her present wealth and increase in every sort of abundance she owes to you (i.e., Constantius), since you provided her with harbours that offer good anchorage for those who put in there. For till then it was considered a dangerous risk even to sail past Antioch; so full were all the waters of that coast, up to the very shores, of rocks and sunken reefs.”¹²⁸

The *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, written at about the same time,¹²⁹ also attests to the importance of this harbor: “Similarly, Seleucia is also a very wealthy city, offering to Antioch its imports, goods pertaining to the public treasury as well as those that are private. The lord of the world, the Emperor Constantius, realising that it is so useful both to him and to the army, cut a very high mountain, let in the sea, and made a large and good harbour where incoming vessels might be secure and the public freight (*fiscale onus*)

Kedrenos, and the *Chronicle of A.D. 724*). There was already a harbor at Seleucia in 306 at the time of Eugenios' revolt (see Downey, 330); presumably Constantius developed this further.

¹²⁶Or. 11.177–78, translation that of G. Downey, in “Libanios' Oration on Antioch,” *PAPS* 103 (1959): 652–86. For further mention of Constantius assembling troops and military supplies at Antioch for coming actions against the Persians, see Julian, *Or.* 1.20d ff, and Libanios, *Or.* 18.166–69, 205–7 and *Or.* 69.69–72, 89–92.

¹²⁷*A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton, N.J., 1961), 361.

¹²⁸Or. 1.40d–41a.

¹²⁹A. A. Vasiliev, “*Expositio totius mundi et gentium*,” *SemKond* 8 (1936): 1–39, after a comprehensive review of previous scholars' views on the matter, places the date of composition in 350 (p. 36). J. Rougé, in his edition of the text in SC 124 (Paris, 1966), pp. 9–26, has 359/60. More recently, Barnes, *Athanasius*, 311 n. 7, placed the date of composition between 347 and 350.

might not perish.”¹³⁰ So too, Libanios, in his *Oration* (the *Antiochikos*), further emphasizes the nature of this work: “In speaking of the outlet of the river into the sea I am impelled to mention the harbour. When he [Constantius] saw that this did not rank among those to which it rightfully belonged, the ruler was troubled and changed its form, and there was cut out in Seleucia, but for the benefit of our city, a harbour hewn from rock at a cost of as much gold as the Pactolus did not treasure up for Croesus. Wherefore all ships put to sea from all parts of the world, carrying goods from everywhere . . . [are] brought here, since the quickness of selling draws hither the wits of merchants, and because of this we enjoy the fruits of the whole of the earth. Among harbours, this has furled the most of the sails that are spread over the seas.”¹³¹ Clearly this harbor was a major feat, undertaken at considerable cost, and brought with it substantial economic benefits. It would have contributed in no small way to the image of Constantius as a benevolent, even philanthropic emperor. The same could be said of Constantius’ adornment of the city, perhaps more so given that, unlike the harbor, these structures had no practical function. These embellishments are enumerated by Julian, again in his first panegyric to the emperor: “I need not stop to mention the porticoes, fountains, and other things of the kind which you caused to be bestowed on Antioch by her governors.”¹³²

Finally, we come to the Great Church at Antioch.¹³³ It is to be regretted that archaeologists have as yet been unable to find remains of this church, while the literary evidence provides no insight as to its location within the city. Work on the church was begun under Constantine¹³⁴ and completed by Constantius, it being dedicated in 341.¹³⁵ Downey, after noting that Theophanes contradicts his own date for the start of work on the church (which he puts in 326/27) by stating in a later passage on its dedication (in 341) that building had taken six years to complete, and that Socrates tells us that the work had been begun ten years prior to the church’s dedication, tentatively suggests “that although the construction was officially inaugurated in A.D. 327, the actual work of building was not begun until later.”¹³⁶ He further notes that “the differing dates given for the inauguration of the work on the church, and the length of time that seems to have been required to build it, may reflect the practical difficulties that seem to have been caused by Constantine’s ambitious building programme.”¹³⁷ In addition, Downey believes the descrip-

¹³⁰ Chap. 28. The translation is that of Vasiliev, “Expositio.”

¹³¹ Libanios, *Or.* 11.263–64.

¹³² *Or.* 1.41a.

¹³³ In the 4th century alone the church was also known as the *Domus Aurea*, the *Golden Church*, and the *Octagonal Church*, for obvious reasons. For descriptions of this church, see Eusebios, *Triakontaeterikos* (9.15) and the *Vita Constantini* (3.50), and Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1883–1885), A.M. 5819. See also Downey, *Antioch*, 342–45, for a more coherent description of the church.

¹³⁴ Jerome (*Chron.* s.a. 327) places the start of work on it in 327, and is followed by Theophanes (A.M. 5819). The “Lost Arian Ecclesiastical Historian” (see J. Bidez, *Philostorgius: Ecclesiastical History*, 212) also has the same date, and is in turn followed by the *Syriac Chronicon miscellaneum ad A.D. 724 pertinens*. Socrates, however, claims that the church was dedicated “in the tenth year after its foundations were laid” (2.8).

¹³⁵ Theophanes, A.M. 5833, p. 36, 29–31, ed. De Boor; Malalas, bk. 13.17; Sozomen, *HE* 35.1–2; the “Lost Arian Ecclesiastical Historian” (see note 134). Jerome wrongly places the dedication in 342 (*Chron.* s.a. 342).

¹³⁶ *Antioch*, 343 n. 106.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.* Downey also notes that “there seem to have been delays connected with the construction of the new capital.”

tion of the church afforded by Eusebios in his *Triakontaeterikos* (delivered in 335) “must represent the church as it was planned” (rather than as it stood at the time), while the description in the *Vita Constantini* represents a later interpolation.¹³⁸ Certainly the closeness of the Greek in these two passages points to someone, either Eusebios or a later interpolator, copying almost verbatim the description from the *Triakontaeterikos* and incorporating it into the *Vita Constantini*.¹³⁹ Given this, it seems quite probable that Constantius, far from merely putting the finishing touches to the Great Church, contributed significantly to its construction.¹⁴⁰ (Again, however, as with building work at Constantinople and secular works undertaken at Ephesos, the task of immediate supervision of the building work was left to an official, the *comes* Gorgonius.¹⁴¹)

The church was dedicated on 6 January (Epiphany) 341 and clearly marked a significant achievement (perhaps the first major one of Constantius’ reign as *augustus*). Indeed, its significance ought not to be underestimated, for if F. W. Deichmann is correct in asserting that the Great Church was in fact a cathedral (as opposed to a palace church),¹⁴² then Constantius can be credited with having played a considerable part in the construction of the first central plan cathedral in the history of Christian architecture. It is little wonder then that Constantius should have commissioned the (pagan) orator Bemarchius to tour the East (including Egypt), delivering a single oration extolling the virtues of this church’s magnificence.¹⁴³

Moreover, Constantius appears cleverly to have used the occasion of the dedication to attempt to enforce religious conformity in the East. Both Socrates and (unsurprisingly) Sozomen inform us that a synod of some ninety bishops was convened at Antioch “under pretence of dedicating the church,”¹⁴⁴ although both authors state implausibly that it was Eusebios of Nikomedeia and not Constantius who lay behind this scheme.¹⁴⁵ The plan was a good one. Constantius took the opportunity of having what must have comprised

¹³⁸ Ibid., nn. 107 and 108.

¹³⁹ Cf. *Triakontaeterikos*, 9.15: μακροῖς ἔξωθεν περιβόλοις τὸν πάντα νεὼν περιλαμβάνων, εἴσω δὲ τὸ ἀνάκτορον εἰς ἀμήχανον ἐπαίρων ὕψος, ἐν ὀκταέδρου μὲν σχήματι κατεποίκιλλεν, οἴκοις δὲ τοῦτο πλείοσιν ἐξέδραις τε ἐν κύκλῳ περιστοιχισάμενος, παντοίοις ἐστεφάνου κάλλεσιν; with *Vita Constantini*, 3.50: μακροῖς μὲν ἔξωθεν περιβόλοις τὸν πάντα νεὼν περιλαβὼν, εἴσω δὲ τὸν εὐκτῆριον οἶκον εἰς ἀμήχανον ἐπάρας ὕψος, ἐν ὀκταέδρου μὲν συνεστῶτα σχήματι, κύκλῳ ὑπερῶν τε καὶ καταγείων χωρημάτων ἀπανταχόθεν περιεστοιχισμένον, ὃν καὶ χρυσοῦ πλείονος ἀφθονίᾳ χαλκοῦ τε καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς πολυτελοῦς ὕλης ἐστεφάνου κάλλεσιν.

¹⁴⁰ It need not surprise us, given that the *Triakontaeterikos* and the *Vita Constantini* were panegyrics of Constantine, that these works should attribute the church’s construction wholly to that emperor.

¹⁴¹ See the church’s dedicatory inscription as provided by Malalas (bk. 13.17): “For Christ Constantine made this lovely dwelling, like in all respects to the vaults of heaven, bright-shining, with Constantius obeying the commands of the ruler; the comes Gorgonius carried out the work of *cubicularius*.” See G. Downey, “Imperial Building Records in Malalas,” *BZ* 38 (1938): 1–15.

¹⁴² “Das Oktogon von Antiocheia: Heroon-Martyrion, Palastkirche oder Kathedrale?” *BZ* 65 (1972): 40–56.

¹⁴³ Libanios, *Or.* 1.39: “he [Bemarchius] had travelled as far as Egypt, delivering just one oration, in which, although he personally was a worshipper of the gods, he spoke in praise of him [Jesus] who had set himself up against them, and discoursed at length upon the church Constantius had built for him.” A. F. Norman, in a note on this passage (*Libanios’ Autobiography* [Oxford, 1965], 158–59 n. 39), writes: “this lecture tour . . . was part of Constantius’ propaganda upon the dedication of the Great Church of Antioch.”

¹⁴⁴ Socrates, *HE* 2. 8. See also Sozomen, *HE* 3.5.2.

¹⁴⁵ It was the emperor, and not a mere bishop, who was responsible for convening ecumenical synods, and there is no reason to accept the orthodox writers’ portrayal of Constantius as being wholly under the sway of Eusebios. On the contrary, Constantius seems to have been every bit as keen (if not more so) as his father to ensure religious unity.

nearly all the bishops of the East—the major ones at least—assembled in one place, and that a newly built edifice in honor of the Lord. Constantius was probably following his father's example here. In 335 Constantine had taken advantage of an assembly of bishops brought together for the dedication of a church, that of the Holy Resurrection at Jerusalem, to convene a council.¹⁴⁶ Here was a truly golden chance; ninety bishops gathered together under the roof of probably the most impressive church in the East, which his father had inaugurated and he was to dedicate. No doubt Constantius hoped that these men, filled with a fond memory for their first imperial patron and a sense of obligation to his son who had so devotedly continued Constantine's work, would end their quibbling and assent to religious unity. Moreover, the creed produced at the council¹⁴⁷ appears to reflect a genuine attempt at reconciliation between the Arian and Nicene parties. Indeed, B. J. Kidd, in his monumental church history, stated that this creed “was at once Semi-Arian and Semi-Nicene.”¹⁴⁸ Constantius' hopes for unity, however, proved to be in vain. The council broke up apparently without achieving anything of great significance,¹⁴⁹ and about a century later more orthodox writers would be portraying it as an attempt “to subvert and nullify the doctrine of consubstantiality.”¹⁵⁰

Julian, in his first panegyric to Constantius, assures us that so great and numerous were that emperor's benefactions to Antioch that the city called itself *Antiochia Constantia*.¹⁵¹ This statement, however, proves problematic. Downey, commenting on it, writes: “Due allowance must of course be made for the fact that Julian was writing a panegyric of Constantius. There is no other evidence that Antioch called itself by the name of Constantius . . . but there is no reason to doubt Julian's statement. It is, on the other hand, remarkable that we have no more evidence in the case of Antioch for the adoption of imperial cognomina, a custom which was widely followed elsewhere.”¹⁵² Clearly, certainty is impossible on this point. Perhaps Julian, in a panegyric that was written in the West, for a western audience, could have embroidered the truth. Indeed, his use of the phrase “I often hear” (ἀκούω πολλάκις) invites suspicion. If it was common knowledge that Antioch called itself after Constantius, Julian could have stated the fact plainly without having to introduce the statement with a phrase that (at best) suggests that this cognomen existed but was not officially recognized.

As for Constantius' building activities elsewhere in the empire, there exist scattered references in the literary evidence to other works of his, although these references are

¹⁴⁶See Athanasius, *De Synodis*, chap. 2.

¹⁴⁷The so-called Dedication Creed, although sometimes also called the Lucianic Creed, after the Antiochene martyr (d. 312) of that name.

¹⁴⁸B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461* (Oxford, 1922), 2.81. D. Bowder, *The Age of Constantine and Julian* (London, 1978), 76, termed it “a new moderate Arian creed.” More recently, R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh, 1988), 284–92, observed how “it has been by different scholars branded as Arian and also anti-Arian” (p. 287); he then goes on to list these scholars and their respective stances (*ibid.*, n. 39). The creed clearly represents an attempt at compromise, it being couched in deliberately ambiguous terms so as to encourage acceptance by moderates of both doctrines.

¹⁴⁹It is to be regretted that, as T. D. Barnes has put it, “the theological deliberations of the Dedication Council cannot be reconstructed” (*Athanasius*, 57). See also H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies in Arianism* (Cambridge, 1900), 119: “its character is one of the most disputed points of the history before us.”

¹⁵⁰Socrates, *HE* 3.10.

¹⁵¹*Or.* 1.40d: ἐπεὶ καὶ τὴν Ἀντιόχου πόλιν ἑαυτὴν σοῦ ἐπώνυμον ἐπονομάζουσιν ἀκούω πολλάκις.

¹⁵²Downey, *Antioch*, 356 n. 172.

frequently uncorroborated and lacking in detail. For example, Ammianus, in his obituary on Constantius, tells us that this emperor erected triumphal arches at great expense in Pannonia and Gaul.¹⁵³ Unfortunately, nothing else is known about these monuments. The same is true concerning John Malalas' assertion that Constantius constructed a bridge over the Pyramus River: "Advancing to Persian territory, he [Constantius] made a peace treaty with the Persians for a certain period, after many on both sides had fallen in the battle. He returned and performed the dedication of the Great Church in Antioch. Then Constantius left Antioch, on his way back to Constantinople, and reached Cilicia. He built there the bridge over the river Pyramus, a very great work (ἔργον μέγιστον). He came to Mopsuestia, a city in Cilicia, and fell ill and died there, at the age of forty."¹⁵⁴ (This passage is echoed by John of Nikiu,¹⁵⁵ who no doubt drew upon Malalas when writing his 7th-century Egyptian Chronicle.)¹⁵⁶ Constantius would have had to cross the Pyramus on his return from Antioch and the eastern front to Constantinople.¹⁵⁷ Indeed, any route from Constantinople to Antioch, be it along the coast of western Asia Minor or the overland road through Galatia and Cappadocia, would have entailed the crossing of the Pyramus.¹⁵⁸ Clearly, then, such an undertaking by Constantius would have been of practical benefit to an emperor who frequently had to take this route.

Unfortunately, the date of Constantius' construction of the Pyramus bridge is difficult to ascertain since the passage of Malalas' chronicle cited above greatly telescopes events. The battle in which both sides lost many men was possibly that of Singara, variously ascribed by modern scholars to either 344 or 349.¹⁵⁹ There was, at that time, no formal armistice between Constantius and Sapor, although an eight-year lull in hostilities occurred in 350 following the unsuccessful siege of Nisibis, which Constantius used to turn west to engage Magnentius, and Sapor to move against the Massagetae, a troublesome

¹⁵³Ammianus, 21.16.15: "quo pravo proposito magis quam recto vel usitato, triumphalis arcus ex clade provinciarum sumptibus magnis erexit in Galliis et Pannoniis titulis gestorum affixis, se (quoad stare poterunt monumenta) lecturis." Clearly these triumphal arches, which Ammianus disparages Constantius so much for having erected, were meant to celebrate the emperor's victories over Magnentius at the battles of Mursa (Pannonia) and Mons Seleucus (Gaul).

¹⁵⁴Book 13.17. The translation is that of E. Jeffreys, *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, Byzantina Australiensia 4 (Melbourne, 1986), Ammianus describes Mopsuestia as "the last station of Cilicia as you go from here, situated at the foot of Mount Taurus" (21.15.2). Cf. *Chronicon Paschale*, s.a. 361: "he came to the springs of Mopsus at the first staging-post from Cilician Tarsus." One of Constantius' last actions, then, would have been to cross the bridge that he had built over the Pyramus earlier in his reign. The bridge crossed the Pyramus at Mopsuestia; see D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, N.J., 1950), 2:1153.

¹⁵⁵*Chron.* 78.7: "Sapor-Arsekus, king of Persia, attacked the Roman empire, and there was much bloodshed between them. And afterwards, they were reconciled and there was peace and tranquility and love between Rome and Persia. On his way back to Byzantium Constantius built a bridge strongly constructed over the river named Pyramus in Cilicia."

¹⁵⁶R. H. Charles, in the introduction to his translation of John of Nikiu's chronicle (Oxford, 1916), believed Malalas was "undoubtedly at our author's disposal" (p. xi).

¹⁵⁷Constantius is attested as having traveled from Constantinople to Antioch or vice versa on at least six occasions: in late summer/early winter 337, early 342, autumn 343, autumn 349, autumn 350, and autumn 361; see Barnes, *Athanasius*, app. 9, "imperial residences and journeys."

¹⁵⁸Alexander the Great crossed the Pyramus at Mallus shortly before his victory at the battle of Issus. The Pilgrim's Road also entailed a crossing of the Pyramus; see D. French, *Roman Roads and Milestones in Asia Minor*, BAR International Series 105 (Oxford, 1981).

¹⁵⁹See Barnes, *Athanasius*, 312 n. 19, for discussion of the two schools of thought that have emerged concerning the dating of this nocturnal battle.

nomadic tribe on his northeastern frontier.¹⁶⁰ Constantius dedicated the Great Church at Antioch in 341 and died at Mopsucrae on 6 November 361. Malalas' chronology is evidently highly confused. However, since Constantius' movements between Constantinople and Antioch (and vice versa) are well attested,¹⁶¹ some tentative suggestions can be made as to the date of construction of this bridge. Constantius traveled from Antioch to Constantinople in early 342 and in the autumns of 343, 349, 350, and 361.¹⁶² Of these dates, the latter two can be ruled out since Constantius was in a desperate hurry to engage the usurpers Magnentius and Julian respectively, and so would not have had time to build a great bridge.¹⁶³ Constantius' journey from Antioch to Constantinople in early 342 was a flying visit to expel the orthodox bishop Paul from his see, with the emperor returning to Antioch by 31 March at the latest.¹⁶⁴ With regard to 349, the evidence for Constantius' presence at Constantinople is far from strong. Indeed, it is based upon two entries in the Theodosian Code¹⁶⁵ which Barnes believes ought to be amended to 343.¹⁶⁶ There remains only the autumn of 343. Barnes, following and emending R. Klein, holds that Constantius celebrated his *vicennalia* at the eastern capital on 8 November 343.¹⁶⁷ On this occasion Constantius may have made a more leisurely journey, giving him time to halt en route and build the ἔργον μέγιστον that was the Pyramus bridge. This would have been an appropriate activity to indulge in on the way to such an event, with news of the feat reaching Constantinople ahead of the emperor. Moreover, Constantius would have been accompanied by a large body of troops (the imperial anniversary required much pomp and ceremony), and the army was traditionally employed on building such works.¹⁶⁸ Perhaps more significantly, we know that Constantius won a victory over the Persians in the summer/autumn of 343, which fits in well with the testimony of John Malalas (and John of Nikiu). In addition, the Dedication Council took place only one year and ten months prior to Constantius' *vicennalia*.

Ephesos, as is attested by the inscriptional evidence, benefited greatly from Constantius' *benevolentia*. He restored the Harbor Baths there—originally a second-century structure—so sumptuously that the baths became known as the *Thermae Constantianae*.¹⁶⁹ In addition, Constantius also restored the Nymphaeum—a great fountain that distributed to all sections of the city the water carried there by the Marnas Aqueduct—following its destruction by fire.¹⁷⁰ The restoration of both of these works was conducted

¹⁶⁰ Malalas (and John of Nikiu) were not the only Byzantine writers to misconstrue this lull for a formal peace; see also John Zonaras, 13.7.

¹⁶¹ See above, note 143.

¹⁶² See Barnes, *Athanasius*, app. 9.

¹⁶³ Sozomen, (*HE* 4.1) informs us of the speed with which Constantius headed west to engage Magnentius; Ammianus (21.15.1) tells us that he was in no less of a hurry to halt Julian.

¹⁶⁴ *CTh* 3.12.1.

¹⁶⁵ *CTh* 12.2.1, 15.1.6.

¹⁶⁶ Barnes, *Athanasius*, 312 n. 18.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 84–85 and n. 6; R. Klein, *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche*, *Impulse der Forschung* 26 (Darmstadt, 1977), 74 n. 179.

¹⁶⁸ See R. MacMullen, "Roman Imperial Building in the Provinces," *HSCPh* 64 (1959): 207–35, esp. 214; and S. Mitchell, "Imperial Building in the Eastern Roman Provinces," *HSCPh* 91 (1987): 333–65, esp. 338.

¹⁶⁹ For the restoration of these baths by Constantius, see *CIL* 3:14195, p. 28.

¹⁷⁰ See C. Foss, *Ephesus after Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1979), 24–25, and 79 f; W. Alzinger, "Ephesus," *RE*, supp. 12:1588–1704, esp. 1606; J. Keil, *Führer durch Ephesos* (Vienna, 1964), 135 f; and *AnzWien* 100 (1963):

by the proconsul Caelius Montius, Constantius (as far as we know) never visiting Ephesos during his reign, although we know from the inscriptions that the emperor gave this official very specific orders concerning Ephesos' embellishment.

There exist other monuments and buildings in the empire that although not directly attested by any of our sources as being the work of Constantius, may perhaps be attributed to him. The obelisk at Arles, for example, may well have been erected in the circus there by Constantius.¹⁷¹ We have seen above that Constantius displayed a particular fondness for obelisks, although the same can admittedly be said of his father. Moreover, Ammianus informs us that Constantius spent the winter of 353/4 at Arles,¹⁷² "where he gave entertainments in the theater and the circus with ostentatious magnificence" in celebration of his *tricennalia*.¹⁷³ That such an occasion would have been marked by the addition of an impressive monument to the circus at Arles is far from improbable.¹⁷⁴

Similarly, the mid-fourth-century cathedral of Milan, later dedicated to St. Thecla, may have owed at least its completion to Constantius. Krautheimer writes that "given its size, the presumable cost of the property required, and the expensive, careful construction of foundations and walls, financial backing must have been strong, possibly involving imperial assistance."¹⁷⁵ He adds tentatively "that work was started between 345 and 350 under Constans . . . and that it was completed, perhaps hastily, after 353 to be ready for the synod of 355." However, more recently, N. McLynn has cast doubt on the notion that the Council of Milan was held in the Great Church there,¹⁷⁶ the implication being that the cathedral may have been completed later than 355. The pushing of the date of the church's completion beyond 355 allows McLynn cautiously to postulate that building work commenced under Constantius and not his younger brother, although ultimately he acknowledges the uncertainty as to "whether construction began under Constantius while he resided in the city or during the reign of Constans."¹⁷⁷ In any event, Constans was murdered by the tyrant Magnentius on 18 January 350 at Autun, and so a substantial proportion (if not all) of the work was probably conducted under the supervision and

47. The latter contains a transcription of one of the two inscriptions that attest to Constantius' rebuilding of this fountain. For the other inscription, see *ÖJh* 15 (1912): B175.

¹⁷¹ For the Arles obelisk, see Humphrey, *Roman Circuses*, esp. 398; C. Sintès, "Quelques remarques sur la spina du cirque d'Arles," in *Le cirque et les courses de chars, Rome-Byzance* (Lattes, 1990), ed. C. Landes 55–63, esp. 55; and G. Hallier, "Le cirque romain," in "Du nouveau sur l'Arles antique," ed. C. Sintès, *Revue d'Arles* 1 (1987): 56–62, esp. 57–58.

¹⁷² Ammianus, 14.5.1, 10.1. Similarly, *CTh* 8.7.28.

¹⁷³ Ammianus, 14.5.1.

¹⁷⁴ After all, we know that Constantine spent time at Arles. Indeed, along with Trier, it appears to have been his principal residence during the period 306–316 (Lactantius, *De Mort. Pers.* 29.5 and *Pan Lat.* 6 (7).14.6, 16.1 ff). See also T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 68–80: Constantine is attested at Arles on 1 August 314, and 7 and 13 August 316. August 316 saw the birth of Constantine's eponymous son, Constantine II, undoubtedly a suitable occasion for the erection of an obelisk in the circus.

¹⁷⁵ *Three Christian Capitals*, 77.

¹⁷⁶ *Ambrose of Milan* (Berkeley, Calif., 1994), 28 ff: "the assumption that this church housed the council of 355 is based on two errors: acceptance of Socrates' and Sozomen's vastly inflated figure of three hundred for the participants of the council, and reliance upon an adjective in Ambrose's account of the expulsion of Dionysius and Eusebius (Ep. extra coll. 14 [63].68: 'cum raperentur de ecclesia maiore,' now shown to be a medieval insertion [M. Zelzer, *CSEL* 82.3, p. 271])."

¹⁷⁷ *Ambrose of Milan*, 29.

with the financial backing of Constantius, whose main residence was Milan (or Como, just outside it) from November 352 to 19 March 357.¹⁷⁸

Constantius, moreover, may well have played a significant part in the construction of the church of San Lorenzo, also in Milan. There exists much controversy concerning the date of construction of this church, with few modern scholars prepared to specify a narrower time span than that of the hundred-year period from 350 to 450. However, of those who attempt a more precise dating, G. Chierici¹⁷⁹ (followed by Dale Kinney¹⁸⁰) argues for a foundation of between 355 and 372 (i.e., during the episcopate of the Arian Auxentius), while Kleinbauer has argued convincingly that San Lorenzo was built after 313 but before the episcopate of Ambrose (374–397).¹⁸¹ Thus one can tentatively argue that there is a reasonably strong probability that Constantius played a part in the building of this church as well as St. Thecla.

Our sources inform us of other ecclesiastical works for whose construction Constantius may have been responsible. For example, there is the Great Church or Caesareum at Alexandria. Athanasios, in his *Apologia ad Constantium*, writes: “The place [i.e., the Caesareum] is ready, having been already sanctified by the prayers which have been offered in it, and requires only the presence of your Piety. This only is wanting to its perfect beauty. Do you then supply this deficiency, and there make your prayers unto the Lord, for whom you have built this house. That you may do so is the prayer of all men.”¹⁸² J. Moreau offers the plausible suggestion that “wahrscheinlich war sie für den Bischof Georgios bestimmt und stand noch vor der Vollendung, als Athanasius sie am 19. April 352 in Besitz nahm.”¹⁸³ In addition, Socrates and Sozomen inform us that Constantius donated a sanctuary of Mithras at Alexandria to the church there.¹⁸⁴

The *Liber Pontificalis* mentions a basilica at Naples known as Santa Restituta, which was constructed along with an eight-mile-long aqueduct and a forum. These it attributes to the emperor Constantine.¹⁸⁵ However, R. Davis has recently argued that “on architectural grounds a date shortly after the middle of the century is thought preferable to the reign of Constantine himself.”¹⁸⁶ Moreover, Davis, after noting that “Constantius’ and his supporters’ involvement in Italian ecclesiastical affairs entailed in or soon after 355 the replacement of Maximus, bishop of Naples, with the Arian Zosimus,” offers the plausible suggestion that “it might have been to mollify local opinion that Constantius founded and endowed a basilica and provided a forum and aqueduct.”¹⁸⁷

¹⁷⁸Constantius spent four winters at Milan: 352/53, 354/55, 355/56, and 356/57; see Barnes, *Athanasius*, app. 9, “imperial residences and journeys.” It is hardly likely that much work was carried out on the Milanese basilica during the tumultuous two years and ten months that Magnentius ruled Italy.

¹⁷⁹*La Basilica di San Lorenzo Maggiore in Milano* (Milan, 1951), 184.

¹⁸⁰“La chiesa paleocristiane di Mediolanum,” in *Milano, una capitale da Ambrogio ai Carolingi*, ed. C. Bertelli (Milan, 1987), 48–79, esp. 60.

¹⁸¹“Toward a Dating of San Lorenzo in Milan: Masonry and Building Methods in Milanese Roman and Early Christian Architecture,” *ArtLomb* 13 (1968): 1–22, esp. 16. It is interesting to note that Eugene Kleinbauer believes Santa Tecla and San Lorenzo to have been “nearly coeval” (p. 16).

¹⁸²Chap. 18 (my emphasis); see also chap. 14. The translation is that of A. Robertson, “Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius,” in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., vol. 4 (Edinburgh, 1891; repr. 1992).

¹⁸³“Constantius II,” *JbAC* 2 (1959): 162–79, esp. 176.

¹⁸⁴Socrates, *HE* 3.2 and Sozomen, *HE* 5.7.

¹⁸⁵*Titulus Silvestri*, in Davis, *Book of the Pontiffs*, 25 f.

¹⁸⁶Davis, *Book of the Pontiffs*, xxvi.

¹⁸⁷*Ibid.*

In addition, Sozomen, when treating the progress of Christianity under the sons of Constantine, stated that “the greatest possible care was bestowed upon the houses of prayer, those which had been defaced by time were repaired, and others were erected from the foundations in a style of extraordinary munificence. The church of Emesa is one most worthy to see and famous for its beauty.”¹⁸⁸ Since Constantius was the only son of Constantine to rule over the East, this impressive church at Emesa must have been built by him. Moreover, as R. P. C. Hanson has noted, there existed a strong link between this emperor and Emesa, since the latter’s bishop, Eusebios, had “accompanied the Emperor Constantius on one of his Parthian campaigns (either 342–50 or 357–60, with probability inclining to the latter).”¹⁸⁹

It is also probable that Constantius put the finishing touches to Constantine’s embellishment of the “tomb of Christ” in Jerusalem. There is broad scholarly consensus—with one notable exception—that attributes the rotunda or *anastasis* surrounding the edicule of the “tomb of Christ” to one of the sons of Constantine,¹⁹⁰ in all probability Constantius,¹⁹¹ since Jerusalem would have fallen under his jurisdiction following the division of the empire after Constantine’s death in 337.

In short, in Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Emesa, Jerusalem, Milan, and Naples, Constantius erected testimonies to his εὐσέβεια, one of the new virtues the ruler of an increasingly Christian Roman Empire was required to display in order to be viewed by contemporaries and posterity alike as a good ruler.

There remains to be discussed only Constantius’ building projects on the eastern frontier. Ammianus writes of Amida (on the upper Tigris): “This city was once very small, but Constantius, when he was still Caesar, in order that the neighbours (*accolae*) might have a secure place of refuge, at the same time as he built another city called Antoninopolis, surrounded Amida with strong walls and towers; and by establishing there an armoury of mural artillery, he made it a terror to the enemy, and wished it to be called after his own name.”¹⁹² Constantius’ fortification of Amida and refounding of Antoninopolis have been correctly viewed by modern scholars “as the culmination of Diocletian’s

¹⁸⁸ *HE* 3.17.3; trans. C. D. Hartranft, “Sozomen’s *Ecclesiastical History*,” in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., vol. 2 (Edinburgh 1957), 297.

¹⁸⁹ Hanson, *Christian Doctrine of God*, 388.

¹⁹⁰ E.g., E. Wistrand, “Konstantins Kirche am Heiligen Grab in Jerusalem nach den ältesten literarischen Zeugnissen,” *Acta Universitatis Gotoburgensis, Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift* 58.1 (1952): 21; K. J. Conant, “Original Buildings at the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem,” *Speculum* 31 (1956): 1–48, esp. 47; C. Coüasnon, *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem*, Schweich Lectures of the British Academy (London, 1972), 14–17; J. Wilkinson, *Egeria’s Travels to the Holy Land*, rev. ed. (Jerusalem-Warminster, 1981), 40; J. E. Taylor, *Christians and Holy Places* (Oxford, 1993), 114, esp. n. 2, 121, esp. n. 13; C. Mango, “The Pilgrim’s Motivation,” in *Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie* (Münster, 1995), 1:1–9, esp. 5 n. 18. The notable exception is M. Biddle, *The Tomb of Christ* (Oxford, 1999), 69 and 149 n. 82.

¹⁹¹ S. Gibson and J. E. Taylor, *Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem*, Palestine Exploration Fund Monograph (London, 1994), 77: “the Anastasis was most likely constructed during the latter part of the reign of Constantius (A.D. 337–361), who consolidated the programme of Christianisation and church building begun by his father Constantine”; and more recently, W. E. Kleinbauer, “The Anastasis Rotunda and Christian Architectural Invention,” *Journal of the Centre for Jewish Art* 23/24 (1988): 140–46, esp. 144 and 146.

¹⁹² Ammianus, 18.9.1. For Constantius’ fortification of Amida, see also the *Chronicle of 724* and the *Chronicle of 846*; and those of Jacob of Edessa, Pseudo-Dionysios, and Michael the Syrian, all of whom appear to have drawn on the *Chronicle of Edessa*. For Antoninopolis (perhaps renamed Constantia by Constantius and later called Tella), see the *Chronicle of Edessa* and its dependents. On these eastern frontier fortresses, see most recently, R. W. Burgess, “Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronology,” *Historia Einzelschriften* 135 (Stuttgart, 1999): 275 ff.

fortification of the frontier.”¹⁹³ Amida was the lynchpin of the Roman defense on the northeastern front. Any invading army would have to take it by siege or risk leaving a heavily fortified enemy position at its rear. The city’s significance (and strength) is attested by the efforts Sapor went to in investing it,¹⁹⁴ the losses the Persian army suffered in taking it,¹⁹⁵ and the dismay felt by the Romans at having lost it.¹⁹⁶ (Antoninupolis, L. Dillemann has suggested, was probably meant more as a defense against troublesome Arab nomads than against the Persian army.)¹⁹⁷

Nor were Amida and Antoninupolis the only eastern frontier forts constructed by Constantius. Jacob the Recluse, in his *History*, writes: “The Tur Abdin was in the midst of these lands (i.e., Mesopotamia) and (Constantius) built two great castles there to protect these countries against Persian bandits: he built one of them at the frontier of Bet Arabia, on the top of a mountain, and the other on the Tigris, and he named it the castle of stone (Hesn-Kef) and he made it the chief city in the land of Arzon.”¹⁹⁸ As R. C. Blockley notes, “if these forts have been properly identified, the first would be part of the northern defences based on Amida, the second of the South based on Nisibis.”¹⁹⁹ Similarly in the East, Theophanes, in all likelihood drawing on a Syriac source, informs us that Constantius “founded a city in Phoenicia, which he named Constantia . . . it had previously been known as Antarados.”²⁰⁰

In conclusion, I would argue that Constantius, like Augustus, embarked on an extensive building program for the same reasons that led his predecessor to leave Rome a city of marble as opposed to one of brick (as he had found it.) Regardless of the function of each individual building or monument, the mere prosecution of a building policy could in itself promote a positive image of the emperor; it revealed *benevolentia*, which itself was the hallmark of a *bonus princeps* or a φιλόανθρωπος βασιλεύς.²⁰¹ Individual projects, on the other hand, could be undertaken by the emperor with a view to displaying his “love of his father” (as with the embellishment of Constantinople); or his piety and/or desire to ensure religious unity by making the clergy feel as obligated to him as they had done to his father²⁰² (as with those churches he had built or completed at Constantinople, Anti-

¹⁹³ F. Millar, *The Roman Near East* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994), 209. See also R. C. Blockley, “Constantius II and Persia,” in C. Deroux, *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 5 (1989, Brussels), 465–90; and C. S. Lightfoot, “The Eastern Frontier of the Roman Empire with Special Reference to the Reign of Constantius II” (D. Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1981).

¹⁹⁴ See Ammianus, 19.2–15, 5.1–8, 7.1 ff.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 19.6.3–13, 9.9.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 20.11.4–5.

¹⁹⁷ L. Dillemann, *Haute Mésopotamie orientale et pays adjacents. Contribution à la géographie historique de la région, du Ve siècle avant l’ère chrétienne au IVe siècle de cette ère* (Paris, 1962), 77.

¹⁹⁸ Trans. M. H. Dodgeon and S. N. C. Lieu, *The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars, A.D. 226–363* (London, 1991), 191.

¹⁹⁹ Blockley, “Constantius II and Persia,” 473 n. 44.

²⁰⁰ A.M. 5838. The translation is that of C. Mango and R. Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor* (Oxford, 1997), 63.

²⁰¹ On an emperor’s *liberalitas* being demonstrated through building works, see F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London, 1977), 133 ff and 420 ff; and R. Krautheimer, “The Ecclesiastical Building Policy of Constantine,” in *Constantino il Grande dall’antichità all’umanesimo*, Colloquio sul Cristianesimo nel mondo antico, vol. 2 (Macerata, 1993), 509–52, esp. 544 ff.

²⁰² D. J. Geanakoplos, “Church Building and ‘Caesaropapism,’ A.D. 312–565,” *GRBS* 7 (1966): 167–86, concludes: “the emperor’s building of religious structures [from Constantine to Justinian] constituted an instrument not only for the furthering of imperial control over the church, but, through imperial insistence on ecclesiastical unity as reflected in the aims of their building policy, for promoting the ultimate aim of unity

och, Milan, and Alexandria); or his martial prowess (as with the triumphal arches in Pannonia and Gaul, and again the obelisk in the Circus Maximus); or the glory, stability, and longevity of his reign (as with the *vicennalia* obelisk at Arles). In addition, sometimes considerations such as political expediency (as with the obelisk at Rome), practicality (as with the port at Seleucia and the bridge over the Pyramus), and military strategy (as with Amida and the other eastern forts and with the walls of Constantinople), also motivated the undertaking of a project. Nor, finally, ought we to exclude the possibility that Constantius, like Augustus, possessed a genuine, deep-seated passion for building, inherited from his father and characteristic of several Roman emperors.

I would further argue that specifically with regard to Constantius perhaps more subtle forces were at play. For example, certain prestigious building projects no doubt provided him with a stage upon which he acted out his *adventus* and other important ceremonies. As noted at the start of this investigation, by far the vast majority of the buildings and monuments discussed above were constructed or erected in Constantius' presence.²⁰³ For example, Constantius' *vicennalia* and *tricennalia* games in the circus at Rome and Arles respectively took place in full view of his newly erected obelisks. The ecclesiastical councils at Milan and Antioch were held in the basilica of the former and Great Church of the latter, both of which Constantius had recently completed. Moreover, one can perhaps safely assume that Constantius' visits to Constantinople were all marked by the opening or completion of a major new structure, be it the baths or the library or whatever.²⁰⁴ (The only exceptions to this rule were the building of the Caesareum at Alexandria and those works conducted by Montius under orders from Constantius at Ephesos.) It is highly probable, therefore, that an emperor who paid so much attention to detail when it came to court ceremony in general and an imperial *adventus* in particular, who took care not to spit or wipe his face in public and to bow as he passed under arches,²⁰⁵ also took great pains with the stage upon which he acted or the backdrop against which the scene was set. Constantius was, after all, a master of ceremony.

Bodleian Library, Oxford

of the empire itself" (186). See, in addition, G. T. Armstrong, "Imperial Church Building and Relations, A.D. 315–565," *ChHist* 36 (1967): 3–17. On the question of a possible relationship between the church foundations of Constantius and his ecclesiastical policy, see most recently W. Hagl, "Die Religionspolitik der Kaiser Constantin und Constantius II. im Spiegel kirchlicher Autoren," in *Christen und Heiden in Staat und Gesellschaft des zweiten bis vierten Jahrhunderts*, ed. G. Gottlieb and P. Barceló (Munich, 1992), 103–29.

²⁰³This was the norm during the 4th century. See MacMullen, 219: "Imperial building activity is concentrated where the emperor is resident, as if the machinery for far-flung subsidies was lacking."

²⁰⁴One would imagine that Constantius played a very active role in the enhancement of his father's city. If circumstances dictated that he must be absent from the capital for much of his reign, one can be sure that he gave very specific orders as to what should be built in the city and where. After all, Constantius went to great personal lengths (despite his absence from the city) to ensure that Constantinople had the best rhetoricians—he picked Themistios for the job himself and ordered Libanios to move there—is it probable that he would have played a lesser part in shaping its physical appearance?

²⁰⁵Ammianus, 16.10.9–10.